DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 186 RC 011 005

TITLE	Indian Education Overview.
INSTITUTION	Indian Education Training, Inc., Albuquerque, N. Mex.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	77
NOTE	77p.; Appendix marginally legible due to light type; Best copy available
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	American Indians; *Educational Administration; *Educational Finance; Educational History; Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; Government Role; *Government School Relationship; Literature Reviews; Parochial Schools; Private Schools; *Public School Systems; Student Teacher Ratio; United States History
IDENTIFIERS	*American Indian Education; Bureau of Indian Affairs; Contract Schools; Mission Schools

ABSTRACT

The major problem in the administration and funding of Indian education is that it has been and continues to be the responsibility of diverse federal, state, and private agencies. Currently there are four school systems involved in Indian education: public schools, Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) schools, contract schools, and mission and other private schools. There is no accurate count of how many Indian students they serve. There has been, however, a dramatic increase in numbers since a 1972 count, possibly because that count was based solely on teacher recognition of Indian students. Indian education funding is available from many sources and under various laws, each of which has different qualification requirements. Current problems in Indian education which must be faced are the resistance of both the BIA and some Indian officials to new educational policy and a lack of funding for properly qualifying public schools. It is recommended that there be development of a BIA funding formula, an efficient system of control of BIA schools, and a state funding formula. Other recommendations include investigations of the relationships between stated educational goals and budget allocations, the distribution of funds within local education agencies, successful Indian education, and related teacher training. BIA school funding and PL 93-638 Title II funding are discussed in detail. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED164186

INDIAN EDUCATION TRAINING, INC.

Indian Education Overview

Report prepared for
National Institute of Education
Summer, 1977

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kathryn Jagoda-Jones

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NOV 1978
ERIC / CRESS
RECEIVED

Myron Jones
Executive Director
Indian Education Training, Inc.
1110 Pennsylvania Street, N.E., Suite C
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87110

RC 011005

INDIAN EDUCATION TRAINING, INC.
1110 Pennsylvania Street N.E. • ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87110
Suite C
(505) 265-7957

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

INDIAN EDUCATION OVERVIEW

I. HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Before the arrival of Europeans, Indian education consisted of three basic courses (1) Survival (2) Religion (3) Ethics. They were, of course, interwoven and were taught primarily by families, clans and leaders of sub-societies, religious and secular, within the tribes.

The first European education began in the sixteenth century in the west with Spanish missionaries, and until well into the nineteenth century virtually all Indian education was conducted by missionaries.

Although it is now fashionable to depict the missionary brethern as frustrated inquisitors who sat up nights plotting the wholesale psychological and spiritual destruction of their charges, they,in fact, had a great variety of motives and approaches to education.

From the perspective of the 1970's, the salvation of souls seems an untrustworthy if not entirely wrongheaded approach to education, but that was also the impetus for all education systems in 17th and 18th century America.

There were two essential differences; (1) Indians controlled the land (2) Even the most unimaginative missionaries were forced to notice that they were dealing with people quite unlike themselves.

If all education represents an accommodation between who people

are and who they will become, the fact that Indians were the inhabitants of a land about to be colonized by others who had produced the missionaries in the first place becomes far more significant than any question of personal or denominational approach or attitude.

By the time the U.S. Constitution was adopted, there had been a number of individual treaties containing provisions for educational services, but the Trade and Intercourse Act of 1802, provided the basis for Federal involvement in Indian education without the requirement of a specific treaty.

Trade and Intercourse Act. Sec. 13

"And be it further enacted that in order to promote civilization among the friendly Indian tribes, and to secure the continuance of their friendship, it shall be lawful for the President of the United States to cause them to be furnished with useful domestic animals, and implements of husbandry, and with goods or money, as he shall judge proper, and to appoint such persons, from time to time, as temporary agents, to reside among the Indians as he shall think fit: Provided, that the whole amount of such presents, and allowance to such agents, shall not exceed fifteen thousand dollars per annum."

Congress created the Bureau of Indian Affairs under the Department of War in 1834. Section 9 of that Act states the following:

"And in all cases of the appointments of interpreters or other persons employed for the benefit of the Indians, a preference shall be given to persons of Indian descent if such can be found, who are properly qualified for the execution of the duties. And where any of the tribes are, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, competent

to direct the employment of their blacksmiths, mechanics, teachers, farmers, or other persons engaged for them, the direction of such person may be given to the proper authority of the tribe."

Clearly Congress had been listening to an increasing number of missionary educators who had been pointing out that Indian education would not work unless it had some roots in the Indian communities themselves.

The Secretary of War, however, was probably not the most objective judge of competence in adversaries or potential adversaries, and it was 1968, or 134 years later,that the first tribal contract for education was signed.

During most of the nineteenth century,education services were contracted through missionary groups of various denominations. There was a simple practical reason for this, and that was that no one else interested in education lived among Indians.

In 1870 an appropriations bill was passed which stimulated the establishment of government schools under the direct supervision of Indian agents.

Indian Affairs was transferred from the War Department to the newly created Department of Interior in 1849, but the Act of 1882 brought the War Department back into Indian education by providing that unused Army posts and barracks be set aside for Indian education and that otherwise unemployed Army officers be detailed to serve as instructors.

This Church/Military coalition might have been good training for a reenactment of the Children's Crusade, but it did not produce

the hoped for successful acculturation of Indians.

Although there was general agreement on the failure of Indian education in the late nineteenth century, there were diametrically opposed analyses and solutions. One asserted that the entire education process had been too abrasive and not related to community goals. The other, exemplified by Colonel Pratt of Carlisle Indian School, maintained that the adult Indian community should be ignored completely and that young Indians should be sent as far from home as possible so as to sever sharply all earlier ties.

Colonel Pratt's point of view won out and until the 1960's Reservation Indians in government schools were sent as far from home as possible, e.g. Eskimos were sent to Ft. Lawton in Oklahoma.

At the same time, as Public School Districts began to develop in what had been exclusively Indian country, the Federal government began to give tuition payments to those public schools that were willing to take Indian students.

The Secretary of Interior's report of 1900 expressed scepticism in the following language ..."notwithstanding the incentive of $10 per capita offered by the government ... indifferent results were obtained." Public schools for Indian pupils, they concluded, are valuable "only when they are located in sections favorable to the coeducation of the races."

At the time of the Meriam report in 1928, still six years before Johnson O'Malley, there were more Indian students in public schools than in Bureau schools. In 1930, 53 percent of Indian students were in public schools. The BIA was negotiating separate contracts with each school district and they were beginning to run past the hundreds into the

thousands. JOM was intended primarily as legislative authority to deal with central contracting agencies, i.e. States.

The Bureau's position relative to financial compensation for school districts was stated by Carson Ryan, Director of BIA Education, 1930-1935, in a letter to the Superintendent of Schools for the State of Washington. He wrote that it was the intention of the Federal government to offset school districts for the loss of taxes and not to pay the entire cost for the education of Indian children.

There was a difference of emphasis on JOM from the beginning. The school districts and States concentrated on the financial compensation, and the Bureau, while acknowledging the justification for the payments, wanted to use their experience to influence curricula and programs for Indian students. They offered to position BIA educators in State Department offices. This was a delicate matter, and when it worked it could be laid, not to a miracle of bureaucratic coupling, but to the diplomacy of the BIA people involved.

In 1936, the Bureau had JOM contracts with California and with Washington. Based on these two programs, however, John Collier's Annual Commissioner's report listed as the most important controlling factors: type and quality of schools actually maintained; amount of money needed to maintain a suitable school adapted to the needs of Indian and white children; amount and value of non-taxable Indian lands; methods of taxation; amount of State support for education; basis of distribution of State support; maintenance and capital outlay costs; changing legislation affecting school finances; distribution of Indian children; and attitudes of whites toward Indians.

There was, of course, no such thing as one national financial

need for Indian education. In Oregon 60% of school budgets were raised from local taxes. In New Mexico less than one-fourth was raised locally. What was important was that the Bureau was unable to effect or have any real control over State programs for Indians. California was the first State to apply for a JOM contract in 1934, but by 1942 the Bureau position of Indian superintendents in California had been abolished.

In 1938, Willard Beatty, the new BIA Director of Education, wrote to the State Superintendent of Schools in Arizona saying that the State of Arizona "would take over the distribution of tuition funds to the several districts." Under those conditions of control, Arizona became the fourth State to Contract for JOM.

This was the beginning of the bureaucratic equivalent of the indefinitely extended separate honeymoon. It is not surprising that Arizona would be shocked to hear the Bureau come back 38 years later to ask the State, however politely, to justify what they had been doing.

PL 874 and PL 815 (Impact Aid) were both passed in 1950 to take care of general operating expenses and construction respectively for students from tax exempt land. The bills, however, were motivated by growing military and other Federal installations and not by Indian lands, which were presumably handled through Johnson O'Malley.

In 1953, both acts were amended to include Indian land, but several States lobbied to avoid an automatic transfer from JOM to PL 874. They wanted the right to retain JOM because they preferred its flexibility to the entitlement formula offered by PL 874. The amendment allowed States to determine which funding they would receive. A transfer to PL 874 meant an automatic cut-off of JOM. Florida and Oregon were the only two of 18 JOM States that transferred to PL 874. Oklahoma was able to receive both types of funding because their JOM was used for special services (lunches,

supplies, books, transportation) rather than basic maintenance and operation.

Congress again amended PL 874 in 1958 and required all States receiving Johnson O'Malley to transfer to PL 874 funding. This did not eliminate JOM. If the new PL 874 funding was less than that previously received from JOM, those districts could use JOM to make up the difference.

On September 13, 1958, the BIA revised their JOM regulations by adding the following language: CFR, Part 33, Section 33.4, Contracts with Public Schools:

> (b) The program will be administered to accommodate unmet financial needs of school districts related to the presence of large blocks of nontaxable Indian-owned property in the district and relatively large numbers of Indian children which create situations which local funds are inadequate to meet. This Federal assistance program shall be based on the need of the district for supplemental funds to maintain an adequate school after evidence of reasonable tax effort and receipt of all other aids to the district without reflection on the status of Indian children.
>
> (c) When school districts educating Indian children are eligible for Federal aid under Public Law 874, 81st Congress (64 Stat. 1100) as amended, supplemental aid under the act of April 16, 1934, supra, will be limited to meeting educational problems under extraordinary or exceptional circumstances.

Section (b) was written as if no one had ever suggested legislation like PL 874. Section (c) acknowledges the existence of PL 874 and limits eligibility to "extraordinary" or "exceptional" circumstances. These key words were never defined by the BIA, but many States and individual school districts rewrote the English language through pragmatic application. By the time these regulations were superseded in 1974, more than 95% of the school districts with eligible Indian students received both PL 874 and JOM. The other 5% were "extraordinary" and "exceptional"

in that they were not eligible, and in those cases their ineligibility was determined by State plans, not by the Bureau.

These regulations were, at best, a distorted reflection of the original intent of the Act; they were an accurate reflection of Federal administrative control. It had passed completely from the Bureau to the States. Authority for administering Indian education had not been delegated to the States; it had been surrendered.

In 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed and almost all Indian students were then eligible for special programs designed for the "educationally and economically deprived."

In 1972, PL 92-318 (Part A, Indian Education Act) was passed which made additional funds available to school districts for special, supplementary categorical Indian needs.

There is no disagreement that PL 874 was initially intended to take care of general operating expenses and that Johnson O'Malley was designed for special needs. The Bureau did not perceive itself responsible for either avoiding or even checking for duplication, and the result was that until 1969 more than 90% of JOM funds were also spent for general operating expenses.

When pressure from outside the Bureau (Indian communities, organizations, the Kennedy Subcommittee Report) tried to force JOM into special need programs, many States and school districts argued that JOM, ESEA, and the Indian Education Act created an excess of special services. It has been generally the goal of school districts to get the maximum amount of non-categorical, non-earmarked money with which they could make all the decisions. That's not surprising. Their wishes are not the problem. The problem is that John Collier's advice in the 1936 Commissioner's

report has not been taken seriously. There has been no test for "type and quality of schools actually maintained; amount of money needed to maintain a suitable school adapted to the needs of Indian and white children; amount and value of non-taxable Indian lands; methods of taxation; amount of State support for education; basis of distribution of State support; maintenance and capital outlay costs; changing legislation affecting school finances; distribution of Indian children; and attitudes of whites toward Indians".

Had the BIA followed its comprehensive education policy of the 1930's, their own government school would have faded out and would require nothing more than an epitaph.

Although the BIA has acted for forty years as if it was going out of the education business, and though the percentage of Indians in BIA schools has diminished considerably, the actual number of students in Bureau schools has increased since the 30's.

There are several reasons for this. (1) Inertia. The natural reluctance of any bureaucracy to put itself out of business. (2) Distance. The physical remoteness of many Indian communities. If the students had not gone to BIA schools, they would not have been able to go at all. (3) Custom. Indian parents who had themselves gone to BIA schools wanted their children to go also. (4) Social Welfare. The BIA schools have functioned not simply as a place of education, but as a part of a complete social welfare system. As the economy of reservations has changed and children have become an economic liability rather than an asset, many Indian parents have been unable to keep their children at home. (5) Social Referral. Although any Indian child who lives more than two miles from the nearest school bus route is automatically eligible for boarding school

enrollment, there are many schools in which the majority of students are "social referrals" from the local BIA agency in which the student lives. This term "social referral" is a catch-all which can mean anything from poverty to the presence of only one parent to diagnosed schizophrenia.

(6) Community Control. Since 1966, BIA schools have received growing support from Indian tribes and communities because of the possibility of local community control of these schools.

The Rough Rock School in Arizona was the first to take over a BIA school under a contract, but they have since been joined by twenty-nine others. There have been numerous political, administrative, and contracting difficulties in this process, but Indian groups have determined correctly that it is easier to take over policy functions in a BIA school than it is to try to take on a public school's system and the state educational agency.

The present BIA educational leadership has acknowledged this trend by developing plans that would increase local control of schools, and at the same time has stated openly that BIA schools are not on their way out.

Whether or not the BIA can run a successful school system remains to be seen. They have demonstrated to the satisfaction of almost everyone that they cannot run a system with one foot out the door.

This brings us to 1977 with four school systems in Indian education. (1) Public (2) BIA (3) Contract schools (4) Mission and other private schools.

II. CURRENT STATUS OF INDIAN EDUCATION

A. Number of students

There is no one accurate count on the number of Indian students in the U.S. The figures depend on who you ask, when and for what purpose.

Part of this can be explained by the various definitions of Indian. The Bureau of Indian Affairs counts only those Indians who are members of the Indian tribes considered eligible for services under the trust responsibility of the Department of Interior, including Eskimos and Aleuts.

The Division of Indian Education (OE/HEW) defines Indians as:

> "Any individual living on or off a reservation who: (a) is a member of a tribe, band, or other organized group of Indians, including those tribes, bands, or groups terminated since 1940 and those recognized now or in the future by the State in which they reside, or who is a descendant, in the first or second degree of any such member; or (b) is considered by the Secretary of the Interior to be an Indian for any purpose; or (c) is an Eskimo or Aleut or other Alaska Native."

The U.S. Census of 1970 simply used self-declaration.

An Office of Civil Rights public school ethnic survey of 1972 used a variety of means including self-declaration, classroom teachers' sight counts, and parents statements.

A sample of the difference in counts is shown in the following charts:

INDIAN PUBLIC SCHOOL COUNTS	
a. 1976 BIA count of students in public schools	149,173
b. 1972 Indian public school (Office of Civil Rights)	232,765
c. US (OIE) count of Indian public school students now being served in Indian Education Act, Part A contracts '76-77	296,123
d. US (OIE) estimate of Indian in public schools (including those eligible but not being served by Indian Education Act, Part A programs	361,125

BIA FIGURES OTHER THAN PUBLIC SCHOOLS	
a. 1976 BIA school enrollment	47,078
b. 1976 BIA count of students in contract schools	3,814
c. 1976 BIA count of students (5-18) in other schools (Mission and private)	11,005

BIA SCHOOL COUNT 1976

Boarding	Day	Living in BIA Dormitories but Attending Public Schools	Mission & Private	Contract Schools
29,255	16,354	2,406	11,005	3,814

BIA count of students (5-18) not known to be in schools	9,036
BIA count of unknowns (5-18)	5,561

(Those students who are enrolled with a BIA agency but whose whereabouts is unknown.)

A detailed chart of public school enrollment can be found in Appendix A.

There are no figures for Indians not enrolled under BIA who are in private or parochial schools or not in school at all.

Although the discrepancy between the BIA's count and OE's count can be explained by the difference in the definition of who is Indian, the differences between the 1972 HEW/Office of Civil Rights count and the HEW/Office of Indian Education program participation count require an explanation.

The following chart demonstrates some of the dramatic increases.

	Total OCR '72 Count	Ind.Teacher/Ind.Pupil Ratio	Total Indian Ed. Program '76-'77	Ind.Teacher'72 OCR Count/Ind.Pupil Title IV Program Count '77
	(32,587)		(58,083)	
Oklahoma				
Lawton	676	1:135	2,041	1:404
Oklahoma City	1,487	1:29	2,173	1:43
Claremore	513	1:100	1,003	1,200
Muskogee	565	1:33	1,079	1:64
Putnam City	1,106	1:37	1,285	1:43
Sallisaw	206	1:17	1,163	1:97
Tahlequah	943	1:27	1,464	1:42
Tulsa	2,654	1:41	2,643	1:40
	(20,132)		(38,061)	
California				
Los Angeles	1,347	1:54	4,509	1:180
Garden Grove	142	1:24	1,375	1:225
Marysville	121	1:30	1,081	1:270
Modesto	101	1:50	1,038	1:519
Visalia	42	0:42	1,831	0:1,831
	(386)		(3,736)	
Louisiana				
Terrebonne		0:386	1,612	0:1,612
Jefferson Parish	163	0:163	650	0:650
LaFourche Parish	1	0:1	612	0:612
St. Bernard Parish	0	0:0	519	0:519
	(6,215)		(19,117)	
Michigan				
Detroit	213	1:4	883	1:17
Flint	52	1:26	768	1:384
Grand Rapids	198	1:99	850	1:422

	Total OCR '72 Count	Ind.Teacher/Ind.Pupil Ratio	Total Indian Ed. Program '76-'77	Ind.Teacher '72 OCR Count/Ind.Pupil Title Program Count '77
Michigan (continued)				
Lansing	142	1:71	433	1:216
Taylor	51	1:12	543	1:135
Sault St. Marie	405	1:135	791	1:263
St. Ignace City	155	0:155	485	0:485
Van Dyke	23	0:23	545	0:545
Wayne	38	1:19	905	1:450

It's obvious that many school districts find far more Indians when they have a program funded on a per pupil basis.

Cynics have suggested that school districts simply create Indians out of others for the sake of higher funding. If this, in fact, has been true, it is a fraud in which parents have participated. The Office of Indian Education requires that each school district submit a form for each Indian child with a parent's signature verifying eligibility.

Whether or not some districts added students, it's equally legitimate to ask the question the other way: Why did so many of the districts have such low Indian enrollment in 1972? There are a number of possibilities. (1) There has been an increased Indian consciousness since 1972, and many of the students and parents who would not have called themselves Indian in 1972 now do so. (2) The 1972 figures were based in many cases on teachers' sight counts, and the teachers included only those students who 'looked Indian' to them.

There are some rural districts, however, with sizable Indian populations (Terrebonne in Louisiana) in which the students lived in a predominately Indian community that must have been known to the school personnel. Terrebonne's count jumped from one Indian to 1,612. One could argue that the Houmas, who are the Indians in that school district, were considered too marginal to count, i.e., they were not Federally recognized and did not live on reservations and were mixed bloods, but in North Carolina, the same status applied to the Lumbees and their '72 and '77 figures are very close.

One mildly sinister explanation is that one important purpose of the '72 count was to determine the relationship between Indian student

populations and Indian teacher populations, and while Terrebonne had approximately 1,600 Indian students, they had no Indian teachers, Robeson County, North Carolina listed 7,537 Indians and 314 Indian teachers.

The entire State of Louisiana had only two Indian teachers in 1972. One was in New Orleans where they listed 32 Indian pupils, another in Woodford where they listed no Indian pupils.

In the '76-'77 OIE program districts that listed a total of 3,736 Indians, they had no Indian teachers listed in the '72 census.

Visalia, California, which now lists 1,831 Indians, counted 42 in 1972 and no Indian teachers.

The preceding chart (p.14) lists those districts with dramatic increases and compares their '72 Indian teacher - Indian pupil ratio and compares it with the '72 Indian teacher '77 Indian pupil ratio. Some of them may, of course, have hired Indian teachers since 1972, but the next OCR count may put other districts in an embarrassing position.

It would still be a mistake to attribute all the low '72 counts, particularly the large urban one, to embarrassment about Indian teacher/ pupil ratio.

Detroit's count jumped from 213 to 883, and even with the new pupil total their ratio is 1:17.

It is more likely that the difficulty was the inability of the classroom teachers to recognize Indians. In 1972, you had to look like Chief Dan George to qualify; now Tony Curtis could pass muster.

	BIA JOHNSON O'MALLEY PROGRAMS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS ON OR NEAR RESERVATIONS	OCR'72 CENSUS	OIE'76-'77 PROGRAM COUNT
Alabama	-	287	1,013
Alaska	11,631 (4)	14,854	18,312 (6)
Arizona	28,448 (1)	24,743 (2)	23,486 (3)
Arkansas	-	565	212
California	2,396(11)	20,132 (4)	38,061 (2)
Colorado	899(16)	2,081	1,300
Connecticut	-	544	196
Delaware	-	132	53
Dist.of Columbia	-	18	no programs
Florida	258(20)	2,039	478
Georgia	-	542	no programs
Idaho	1,969(13)	2,122	2,127
Illinois	-	3,655	1,092
Indiana	-	1,123	67
Iowa	218(22)	967	761
Kansas	220(21)	2,434	1,235
Kentucky	-	173	no programs
Louisiana	-	386	3,736 (14)
Maine	-	491	748
Maryland	-	704	1,344
Massachusetts	-	554	407
Michigan	698(18)	6,215 (11)	19,117 (5)
Minnesota	3,607 (8)	10,513 (8)	11,280 (8)
Mississippi	28	140	34
Missouri	-	2,120	28
Montana	7,064 (5)	5,680 (13)	9,265 (9)
Nebraska	849 (17)	1,076	1,547
Nevada	2,805 (10)	2,833	2,834
New Hampshire	-	51	no programs
New Jersey	-	654	no programs
New Mexico	21,905 (2)	22,134 (3)	23,859 (4)

	BIA JOHNSON O'MALLEY PROGRAMS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS ON OR NEAR RESERVATIONS	OCR'72 CENSUS	OIE '76-'77 PROGRAM COUNT
New York	1,837 (14)	5,852 (12)	5,328 (12)
North Carolina	-	14,571 (6)	15,448 (7)
North Dakota	2,082 (12)	4,017 (15)	3,996
Ohio	-	1,625	1,511
Oklahoma	14,987 (3)	32,587 (1)	58,083 (1)
Oregon	1,195 (15)	3,787	5,184 (13)
Pennsylvania	-	753	no programs
Rhode Island	-	164	no programs
South Carolina	-	490	55
South Dakota	4,683 (7)	9,009 (9)	9,191 (10)
Tennessee	-	281	no programs
Texas	-	2,953	1,022
Utah	600 (19)	5,055 (14)	3,423 (15)
Vermont	-	49	no programs
Virginia	-	1,212	254
Washington	6,576 (6)	11,739 (7)	17,482
West Virginia	-	228	no programs
Wisconsin	3,011 (9)	6,404 (10)	6,438 11)
Wyoming	1,120 (16)	2,028	1,206

III . FINANCING INDIAN EDUCATION

BIA

Schools run directly by the Bureau of Indian Affairs receive basic support through the BIA, Department of Interior, under the Snyder Act of 1922.

They also receive supplementary funds under PL 89-10 (ESEA) Title I.

Some schools receive discretionary funding under ESEA Title III, Title VI, Part B, Title VI, Part G and N.D.E.A. Title III.

Federal reservation students theoretically receive the same State aid available to non-Indian students. I say theoretically because there is no precise information on the degree to which some of the states use Federal funds to supplant state money that would otherwise be available.

Arizona, for example, has a state funding formula that provides money to school districts based on operational program costs for the previous year. However, school districts are not allowed to count the PL 874 funds they used, so the state distribution per pupil is less than it would be in districts which used comparable local levies rather than impact aid funds.

The Indian school districts in the State of Maine received Federal recognition in 1975 and became eligible for Impact Aid funds in school year '75-'76.

In the past, when Maine had State Reservations exempt from property tax, the State of Maine provided all basic program costs. Since there is no precise formula for these districts, and the budget is negotiated every year, they may take PL 874 into account when deciding what the state allocation will be.

They have formally asked the Washington PL 874 office for permission to take credit for PL 874 funds in their equalization system beginning in the Fall of '78.

All Federal reservation students are counted as Part 'A' students (the highest funding category) for PL 874 purposes. In '76-'77 only New Mexico and Kansas counted PL 874 for equalization purposes. Both do this legally under the PL 874 Dole Amendment of 1975. Alaska may qualify by '78-'79.

Public school students who are counted as eligible for BIA services are all eligible for Johnson O'Malley funding. Since the regulations of 1975 (PL 93-638, Title II) state that preference will be given to those Indians who live on or near reservations, other Indians, though technically eligible will not, in fact, receive funding without heavy handed negotiation as an unforseen and dramatic increase in Johnson O'Malley appropriations.

Local education agencies can now receive Johnson O'Malley payments for basic operational support if they meet the following criteria:

REQUIREMENTS FOR BASIC SUPPORT

To contract for operational support, a public school disrict shall be required to establish as part of the proposal that:

(i) It cannot meet the applicable minimum state standards or requirements without such funds.

(ii) It has made a reasonable tax effort with a mill levy at least equal to the state average in support of educational programs.

(iii) It has fully utilized all other sources of financial aid, including all forms of state aid and PL 874 payments. The state aid contribution per pupil must be at least equal

to the State average.

(iv) There is at least 70 percent eligible Indian enrollment within the school district.

(v) It shall clearly identify the educational needs of the students intended to benefit from the contract.

(vi) It has made a good faith effort in computing State and local contributions without regard to contract funds pursuant to this part.

(vii) It shall not budget or project a deficit by using contract funds pursuant to this part.

PL 93-638, Title II 1975

Johnson O'Malley basic support payments are now scheduled to phase out after the '77-'78 school year, but new legislation has been introduced both to extend the payments indefinitely and to modify eligibility. The most active bill would allow any school districts that had a 15% Indian population to collect Johnson O'Malley funds to meet its proposed budget deficit. All funds would be non-categorical and not subject to approval by the local Indian Johnson O'Malley committee.

NOTE: This bill has not passed the appropriate sub-committee and will probably have a difficult time.

All other Johnson O'Malley funds (approximately 27 million out of 30 million) must be used for supplementary programs to meet the special needs of Indian students. If non-Indians also participate in the program, Johnson O'Malley is supposed to pay only a pro-rata share for the Indian portion.

All Jonnson O'Malley programs must have the signed approval of the local Indian committee which must be selected by the local tribe or community.

TITLE IV PART A PROGRAM INFORMATION

Over 2,000	Indian Population	Total School Population	% of Indian Population
Gallup, NM	9,039	12,310	73.4
Central, NM	4,602	5,122	89.8
Albuquerque, NM	2,457	82,502	29.7
Anchorage, AK	2,957	36,733	8.0
Chinle, AZ	4,034	4,320	93.3
Tuba City, AZ	2,607	2,795	93.2
Window Rock, AZ	2,871	3,061	93.7
Los Angeles, CA	4,509	689,117	.65
Minneapolis, MN	2,930	54,613	5.3
Robeson Co., NC	7,958	12,000	61.8
Lawton, OK	2,041	19,397	10.5
Oklahoma City, OK	2,173	47,965	4.5
Tulsa, OK	2,643	61,547	4.3
	50,821	1,031,482	

Under 1,000	Indian Population	Total School Population	% of Indian Population
Bethel, AK	1,350	1,389	97.1
North Slope, AK	1,163	1,086	93.3
Northwest Artic, AK	1,263	1,366	92.4
Flagstaff, AZ	1,095	8,485	12.9
Ganado, AZ	1,638	1,705	96.0
Kayenta, AZ	1,614	1,844	87.5
Whiteriver, AZ	1,289	1,356	95.0
Garden Grove, CA	1,375	55,548	2.4
Marysville, CA	1,081	8,805	12.2
Modesto, CA	1,038	9,000	11.5
Carmichael, CA	1,035	56,084	1.8
Tulare, CA (Visalia)	1,831	3,000	61.0
Terrebonne, LA	1,612	22,889	7.0
Browning, MT (Elementary)	1,295	1,340	96.6
Browning, MT (High School)	490	549	89.2
Claremore, OK	1,003	2,975	33.7
Muskogee, OK	1,079	7,728	13.9
Putnam City, OK (Oklahoma City)	1,285	20,094	6.3
Sallisaw, OK	1,163	2,156	53.9
Tahlequah, OK	1,464	3,096	47.3
Rapid City, SD	1,305	13,021	10.0
Shannon, County	1,986	1,781	89.6
Todd, County	1,502	1,771	84.8
San Juan, UT	1,281	2,716	47.2
Seattle, WA	1,623	62,774	2.5
Milwaukee, WI	1,463	104,565	1.3
Bernalillo, NM	1,332	2,904	45.8
Grants, NM	1,023	5,148	19.8
Tacoma, WA	1,056	32,254	3.2
	37,734	437,429	

Over 500	Indian Population	Total School Population	% of Indian Population
Fairbanks, AK	926	9,686	9.6
Ketchikan, AK	703	2,689	26.1
Juneau, AK	950	4,430	21.4
Kenai, AK	624	5,049	12.4
Kodiak, AK	679	2,162	31.4
Lower Yukon, AK	734	2,710	27.1
Nome, AK	824	942	87.4
Sitak, AK	686	1,810	37.9
Dillingham, AK	501	525	95.4
Yukon Koqukuk, AK	587	647	
Puerco, AZ	571	680	83.9
Rice, AZ (Elementary)	878	901	97.4
Sacaton, AZ	852	857	99.4
Scottsdale, AZ	501	26,199	1.9
Tempe, AZ	850	13,164	6.4
Tucson, AZ (Elementary)	784	40,222	1.9
Cerritos, CA	981	23,234	4.2
Crescent City, CA	598	3,970	15.1
Elk Grove, CA	784	10,468	7.4
Fontana, CA	682	13,756	4.9
Fresno, CA	650	59,188	1.1
Hoopa, CA	610	1,293	47.1
Livermore, CA	500	13,697	3.7
Concord, CA	920	50,268	1.8
San Francisco, CA	534	78,126	.7
Ventura, CA	810	18,242	4.4

Over 500	Indian Population	Total School Population	% of Indian Population
Blackfoot, ID	869	4,228	20.5
Chicago, IL	917	528,355	.17
Wichita, KA	550	57,254	.96
Gretna, LA	650	66,699	.97
Thibodaux, LA	612	19,092	3.2
Chalmette, LA	519	13,597	3.8
Baltimore, MD	571	159,044	.35
Bay City, MI	598	16,424	3.6
Detroit, MI	883	242,831	.36
Flint, MI	786	40,231	1.9
Grand Rapids, MI	850	38,321	2.2
Sault Saint Marie, MI	791	5,059	15.6
Taylor, MI	543	21,357	2.5
Van Dyke, MI	545	6,369	8.5
Wayne, MI	905	23,191	3.9
Duluth, MN	642	19,381	3.3
Red Lake, MN	886	890	99.55
St Paul, MN	715	40,857	1.7
Browning, MT	490	549	89.2
Hardin, MT	558	1,224	45.5
Poplar, MT	490	645	75.9
Reno, NV	684	31,717	2.1
Bloomfield, NM	774	2,328	33.2
Cuba, NM	652	1,043	62.5
Dulce, NM	560	671	83.4
Farmington, NM	849	6,918	12.2
Tularosa, NM	635	1,528	41.5
Buffalo, NY	792	64,296	1.2
New York, NY	750	1,125,449	.06
Salmon River, NY	617	1,863	33.1
Syracuse, NY	910	26,389	3.4

	Indian Population	Total School Population	% of Indian Population
Fayetteville, NC	872	11,637	7.4
Fairmont, NC	705	2,770	25.4
Raeford, NC	742	4,760	15.5
Maxton City, NC	550	1,712	32.1
Red Springs, NC	521	1,823	28.5
Scotland, County	715	7,103	10.1
Belcourt, NC	987	1,026	96.2
Cleveland, OH	824	131,812	.6
Anadarko, OK	800	2,184	36.6
Bartlesville, OK	688	6,876	10.0
Broken Bow, OK	997	2,271	43.9
Ada, OK	959	1,496	64.1
Catousa, OK	605	1,852	32.6
Coweta	666	1,748	38.1
Durant, OK	803	2,455	32.7
Eufaula, OK	513	1,166	43.9
Hugo, OK	814	1,947	41.8
Idabel, OK	551	2,162	25.4
Wilburton, OK	566	1,380	41.0
McAlester, OK	502	3,713	13.5
Miami, OK	912	2,856	31.9
Moore, OK	790	12,722	6.2
Noble. OK	714	1,554	45.9
Purcell,OK	510	1,090	46.7
Salina,OK	561	812	69.1
Sand Springs, OK	499	4,798	10.4
Shawnee, OK	523	4,753	11.0
Skiatook, OK	761	1,528	49.8
Stilwell, OK	884	1,454	60.7
Tolihina, OK	559	690	81.0
Vian,OK	475	1,070	44.3
Vinita, OK	823	1,594	51.6

Over 500	Indian Population	Total School Population	% of Indian Population
Jefferson Co., OR	660	2,316	28.4
Portland, OR	864	60,164	1.4
Eagle Butte, SD	852	948	89.8
Sisseton, SD	617	1,513	40.7
Dallas, TX	609	150,098	.4
Tacoma, WA	606	34,453	1.7
Seattle, WA	612	23,326	2.6
White Swan, WA	503	974	51.6
Spokane, WA	868	31,886	2.7
Wapato, WA	679	2,838	23.9
Yakima, WA	850	11,858	7.1
Shawano, WI	753	3,492	21.5
Superior, WI	501	7,003	7.1
	71,677	3,510,398	

Since the passage of the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975, Indian tribes and organizations sanctioned by the tribes to be served have first preference for contracting Johnson O'Malley funds if they decide to do so before January 31st of the year in which the next school year's contract is to begin. (January 31, 1978 for the '78-'79 school year.)

Current regulations allow the Johnson O'Malley contractor to spend the funds either within or outside an LEA.

This, in effect, represents a shift from a defacto school district entitlement to an Indian entitlement, but it applies only when there are Indian contractors. All contracting State education agencies distribute all the funds to school districts, and will continue to do so. In fact, so do most of the Indian contracting agencies, but that's probably because they were not allowed to spend money outside the schools until November, 1975.

There are only two fixed requirements for Johnson O'Malley supplementary programs, (1) they must be related to education, and (2) they must be approved by the BIA Area Offices.

All school districts having ten or more Indian students (one will suffice in California, Alaska, and Oklahoma) are eligible to apply for funds under the previously mentioned Indian Education Act (PL 92-318 Title IV, Part A).

The law authorizes payments up to the state average operational cost per pupil for each Indian student served. In all but a few instances, school districts have listed their entire Indian student population as the target group. In spite of the high authorizations, appropriations have never exceeded 10% of the total.

Funding under the Act is based on the number of students to be

served multiplied by the state average, and then ratably reduced by the actual appropriation level.

The chart for '76-'77 program expenditures by state is included in Appendix B.

Under this section of the Act there is a maximum 10% set aside for Indian controlled schools that are not LEA's,but all the other money must be contracted through an LEA. In all school districts, the program must have the written approval of an Indian education committee selected by the Indian parents whose children are to be served, teachers of those children, and Indian secondary students where applicable. The committee is also to represent these three populations, but the Indian parents must constitute a majority.

As stated in the beginning of the section on Indian student population page 13, the Act has a broad definition of Indian, and the result is that many Eastern and urban communities that were never eligible for Johnson O'Malley programs have, since 1973, been operating Indian programs for the first time.

Although less than 50% of the eligible school districts apply for Part A funds, the districts with sizable Indian populations do. OIE estimates that they reach 82% of eligible students.

Since all Indian students are also citizens of the states in which they reside, they are eligible for any other state, Federal, or local special programs for which they qualify as individuals. In practice, this does not always work because some school districts will offer Indian programs (Johnson O'Malley or Title IV) as a substitute for programs such as ESEA Title I even though the Indian students are eligible and attending what would normally be an ESEA target school.

NOTE: This will be discussed in detail in a later section.

There are three types of Indian controlled schools which receive Federal funding. (1) Schools formerly controlled by the Bureau of Indian Affairs but now contracted through tribes or tribally sanctioned organization. (2) Previously private schools on or near a reservation now under Indian control and incorporated either through a state or a tribe. (3) Non-LEA's which are Indian controlled but are either not incorporated or not on or near a reservation.

The first two categroies of these schools receive their basic funding either through the BIA, the Office of Indian Education (Part A 10% set aside) or both.

In 1976-77 the BIA funded twenty-five schools, eight of which were former BIA schools, and the Office of Indian Education funds twenty-six. The lists are not identical. Fifteen of these schools receive funding from both sources, but the BIA funds ten schools which do not receive OIE funds and OIE gives money to eleven schools that are not on the BIA list. Different regulations, policies, and Indian definitions account for the discrepancy.

One important difference between BIA and OIE funding is that BIA contracts provide funds for a school's basic educational program whereas the OIE programs add to the existing programs. In fiscal '77, OIE divided approximately 2.25 million dollars among its twenty-six schools. The BIA provided 11 million to twenty-five schools.

Indian controlled schools not connected with reservations may be eligibile for grants under Part B of the Indian Education Act, but their funding will be considerably lower than schools eligible under the Part A set aside because appropriation is divided among far more grantees. Part B eligibility extends to all Indian education organizations, tribes,

colleges, universities, and public and private institutions.

As a result of this, off-reservation schools have relied heavily on private sources for their survival.

In summary, Indian education is financed through a variety of sources ranging from full basic education costs including room and board in some Bureau of Indian Affairs schools to public schools with non-BIA Indians that neither ask for nor receive any special Federal monies for their Indian students.

In spite of all the discussion of federal sources of funding, if one were to tote up all sources of funding for all Indian students in public schools nationally,statewide education funds would make up the largest single source of Indian education money.

In spite of this, there are individual states, Nebraska and South Dakota, for example, whose federal monies per Indian pupil are greater than state funds allocated per Indian pupil.

This question will be discussed in greater detail in Sections V and VI.

IV . REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE REGARDING INDIAN ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

In early 1977 the National Indian Education Association conducted a search of all literature on Indian education written since 1971.

They discovered more than 3,000 books, theses, position papers, and journal articles on the subject. There has been no shortage of comment.

The overwhelming majority of the material has dealt with the social and psychological questions related to pedagogy and the various school environments that effect Indian students.

There are four consistent patterns in the literature.

(1) Laborious documentation of the obvious, e.g. Indians who live near English speaking communities tend to speak English more than Indians who live in remote areas.

(2) Horror stories. These papers fairly drip with gloom. Disaster and tragedy are used so often, they cease to have impact.

(3) Cure-alls. In these papers all problems are defined only in relation to a pre-determined solution, invariably the specialized field of the diagnostician.

(4) Oh, if only. These studies concentrate on the imperfect past and improbable future and conclude either that the present is unmanageable because of the attitude of 18th century missionaries, or that the future will be fine only if and when all Indian tribes are represented in the United Nations.

Considerable energy has also been expended demonstrating that there is no intelligence test which measures innate intellectual ability with divine objectivity.

If all the paper used were converted back into lumber, it might solve the Indian housing shortage, but barring that unlikely event, it can

be said that very few studies have had any impact at all. In fairness, they were not meant to have an impact. They were generally written by social scientists who wrote them for a select group of other social scientists with specific and narrow interests in a particular aspect of Indian education.

Fewer than ten percent of the 3,000 documents have dealt with questions on administration and finance, and most of the papers on administration have dealt with political questions, i.e., issues of Indian control.

The majority of the Indian control papers begin with a basic premise. Nothing can change in Indian education until Indians themselves control the schools. Here there is a split. Some writers believe that can only be done in small community controlled schools which are all Indian. Others believe it can also be done in public school systems if Indians control a majority of the school board, and the most optimistic group believes it can be done if Indians have significant representation on the boards.

If you accept any of the above premises, it is reasonable to concentrate on political control questions and ignore all others.

It is understandable that the issue of Indian controlled schools, particularly community controlled schools, should receive so much attention. This movement, which had only one school in 1967, has grown to thirty schools in 1977.

The schools have a potential for major change not found in local educational agencies under a state system and not found in government run BIA schools.

This emphasis on the new day a dawning is commendable, but it

leaves a great vacuum. In spite of the rapid growth of these schools, the enrollment of Indians in public schools continues to grow yearly both in real numbers and in percentages. If all the present BIA schools and mission schools were to be converted into community contract schools in the next five years, their student population would still represent only one-third of all Federally connected Indian students and one-sixth of all Indian students, including State, terminated, and unrecognized tribes.

Since 1968, there have been ten widely disseminated papers, articles, or studies on Indian education administrative and financial questions.

(1) U.S. Senate Kennedy Subcommittee Report (1968)

(2) NAACP "An Even Change" (1970)

(3) Office of Indian Education Study (Van Loon Section) (1973)

(4) Smith and Walker Study (1973)

(5) Office of Indian Education Study, ACCO, "So That Indian Children Shall Have Equal Opportunity" (1974)

(6) Stanford Law Review (Rosenfelt) (1974)

(7) American Education Research Association, "Indian Education - Confused Responsibilities; Predictable Results" Jones (1974)

(8) University of New Mexico Press "Education and the American Indian" Szasz (1973)

(9) P.L. 93-638, Title II Study (1975)

(10) American Indian Policy Review Commission (1977)

"Education and the American Indian" is a full length book which deals with finance and administration as well as a number of other education questions. All the rest were either studies or reports.

There are common themes in all nine studies. (1) Although the

Federal government (Impact Aid) compensates local school districts, and now, in some cases, states for tax loss resulting from Federal impact, many LEA's and states continue to act and talk as if the presence of Indian students inevitably creates a financial burden. (2) Although the Federal government provides numerous compensatory programs (Johnson O'Malley, Indian Education Act, Part A, ESEA, Title I) to fill the gap between school districts' resources and Indian education needs, the funds frequently do not reach the intended recipients. (3) Compensatory programs are frequently illegal, irrelevant or unwise. (Sometimes all three) (4) Special Federal programs were designed to involve Indian parents in all phases of the educational process and the laws were written accordingly. This has usually not happened to the degree set out in legislation or regulations, and in some cases, has not happened at all. (5) Federal compensatory funds are frequently used to supplant state or local funds in spite of protective regulations. (6) Many school districts do not have an equitable distribution of funds within their own district boundaries. (7) Federal monitoring of funds both for basic support and supplementary programs is inadequate. (There are several reports from the General Accounting Office that deal with the lack of accountability and the absence of a rational formula for distribution of funds.)

All the above comments have been made again and again in discussing all other students who are ostensibly to be saved through well placed and well programmed Federal money.

These reports, however, do discuss three issues in Indian education that are either different in kind or degree. (1) Federal Indians have an alternative "public" school system, the Bureau of Indian Affairs. (2) Because Indian education was for so long exclusively a Federal responsibility, and

because it continues to be also a Federal responsibility, Indians in some States and some individual locales are not considered to be entitled to a free public education in the same sense in which all other state residents are. (3) Although it is a rule of thumb that a school district will be relatively poor when the district population is poor, there are a considerable number of Indian districts that are not poor by any ordinary standards. (4) National education policy bears a describable relationship to general national policies; Indian education is more a reflection of national Indian policy. The difference is important.

Smith and Walker (1973) examined the BIA's funding system for its schools and found it not to be a system at all. They described it as a "bureaucratic enigma." Reports from the General Accounting Office agree.

The BIA is presently (1977) working on a system for developing a funding formula.

Existence of dual responsibilities for Indian education has produced the following situations. The State of Arizona threatened to close twelve reservation public school districts unless the Bureau of Indian Affairs withdrew its proposed five percent budget cut in Johnson O'Malley funds. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has constructed and maintained dormitories for Indian students in towns with public schools. They have then paid full tuition for these students in the local public school systems. In many cases, the districts already collected up to 70% of their tuition from State funds and, in effect, made a profit on the students. In 1975, the BIA passed regulations that deducted state payments from the amount of tuition the BIA would pay. This Fall, one of the effected school districts turned away the Indian students on registration day because the BIA was not willing to make up the difference between the state funding and the average

per pupil costs of education.

Education and the American Indian, (Szasz) describes in some detail the relationship between education policy and Indian policy. When forced acculturation was the issue, it formed the guiding philosophy of government schools. When forced acculturation was abandoned, the government schools changed their policies accordingly. The book also documents the failure of the BIA's attempts to influence the states and LEA's in their approach to Indian education.

Part of this failure was, of course, structural. The BIA simply had no authority within State Departments of Education. The other part had to do with a lack of collective action that joined Indian and BIA concerns.

During the past five years, the BIA has begun to reassert itself, primarily because of Indian insistence that it do so.

It is not possible to assess the long range effect of these studies, but their immediate political impact can be measured. The Kennedy Subcommittee Study, "An Even Chance", and the PL 93-638 study had a considerable and measurable influence on reform.

The Kennedy Subcommittee Study was widely distributed, well documented, and was a major factor both in the passage of the Indian Education Act of 1972 and in creating pressure for reform of existing legislation and regulations.

"An Even Chance" was widely used as a community training handbook and created national and local pressure for reform.

Major portions of the 93-638 study were directly incorporated into the new Johnson O'Malley regulations of 1975.

All these reports are politically related. It is doubtful that

"An Even Chance" would have had its audience without the publicity and attention given the Kennedy Subcommittee Report, and it is questionable whether or not the 93-638 recommendations would have been accepted by the BIA if it were not for the reform mood created by the earlier reports.

V. MAJOR PROBLEMS AND POLICY QUESTIONS RELATED TO THE FINANCE AND ORGANIZATION OF INDIAN EDUCATION WHICH THE NATION WILL FACE IN THE NEXT DECADE

1. Bureau of Indian Affairs Education

BIA education has been under steady attack ever since 1949 when the Department of Indian Affairs was transferred from the War Department to the newly created Department of Interior. They were charged with mistakenly trying to civilize Indians, not successfully civilizing Indians, kowtowing to missionaries, not paying enough attention to missionaries, sending young children far from home, not sending children far enough from home, and generally presiding over well documented educational failure.

Invariably, BIA education has been treated as if it exists independently of other BIA policies or Department of Interior policies. It does not. With the notable exception of the thirties when John Collier was Commissioner of the Bureau and actively supported his Education Director, Carson Ryan, the BIA has reacted to criticism by developing defensive skills to a point of near genius. They have successfully defused opposition by agreeing with all criticism and assuring their critics that things are worse than they seem to be. They have successfully pitted one set of critics against another. They have pitted one group of Indians against another both among tribes and within tribes. They've dug out ninety foot bunkers and simply waited until the shelling was over. They have developed "the bigger picture" to a point where no landmarks, let alone human beings, are visible. They have developed an administrative structure in which no individual or office can be held accountable for anything.

This history has produced three major results that have serious implications for the future of BIA education. Key congressional committees, the Comptroller-General, and recent administrations, including the new one,

have grown arm weary attacking the BIA and have seriously threatened to move Indian education elsewhere, usually to HEW, but sometimes under entirely new structures created for that purpose.

This means that the Bureau must either improve its defensive strategies or change because of the increasing pressure from above.

Many tribes and other Indian groups have become advanced students of the BIA's tactics and have developed new methods of forcing change. The most effective device has been to exploit the BIA lassitude and develop policy from the outside which the Bureau is forced to accept because it has no alternative of its own and has lost the ability to pronounce an audible 'no'. At the same time, as Indian tribes and groups have found ways to force some change in the BIA education policies, plans to move Indian education outside of the BIA have received diminishing support from federally connected Indians.

There are two principle reasons for this. One is a fear that any decrease in BIA programs, any dismantling of the agency may lead to termination of federal services. The second reason is simpler. It's better to contend with a familiar adversary than a new one.

Because the BIA has not offered new policy in education, it is not expected unless forced from the outside. One consequence of this was that when the Bureau selected a new director of education who did have policy ideas, they were frequently regarded with suspicion by the very Indian community they were meant to help. The Director, Dr. William Demmert, had a number of reorganization ideas; but the most daring, by far, was a plan to provide direct funding to all BIA schools and to give the local Indian committees policy control. Under the present system in which the schools go through both their agency and area offices, the Indian committees

have only advisory status.

Since this proposed plan would, in effect, bypass both the agency and area offices, these offices quickly solicited as much opposition as they could. Their approach to tribal governments met with some success. They maintained that the Demmert plan was intended to subvert tribal authority because it would deliver the funds and political power directly to the Indian groups around the school unit. They argued that it ignored contracting rights under the Indian Self-Determination Act. That was not true and isn't true now. Nothing in the plan was intended to subvert tribal contracting. Direct funding was proposed only for those places where the tribe or a tribally authorized group did not wish to contract.

Regardless of the truth, the area office/agency campaign had some political success. They had picked the right red herring. The Indian Self-Determination Act is viewed by tribes as being both important and deserving of great suspicion, precisely because it promises so much tribal authority and independence. Any suggestion that any part of the BIA was developing plans to subvert it before it got underway met with a ready audience.

Indian tribes, unlike many other minority or poor communities operate out of a conservative perspective. There's a good reason. Indian reservations have a great deal to conserve: land, water and trust status. The "nothing to lose" action that frequently characterizes other minority groups is not there. A skilled status quo specialist can get considerable mileage out of saying, "This is a new idea. I have no opinion on it myself, but, of course, it's hard for us to know exactly how it will work or what it will mean ten years from now."

There cannot be direct funding from Washington unless there is an

equitable, rational, and defensible funding formula.

The BIA does not run one school system; it runs eleven, one for each BIA Area office. Each BIA school, including BIA contract schools, now negotiates its budget, and program with the local BIA agency. It is then negotiated with the BIA Area office, which has the responsibility for budget and program contract approval. The Area offices then take all of their school contracts and negotiate them with the Commissioner of the BIA (now called the Undersecretary of Indian Affairs.) The Director of BIA Education is not a part of this process and does not have line authority over BIA schools.

To the extent that a given BIA school is satisfied with its negotiations through this system and feels that it's getting its share and then some, a national formula and centralized authority is unwelcomed. Advocates of equitable funding will find their entire constituency clustered around the short end of the stick.

This does not mean the BIA cannot develop a system of tribally controlled or local committee control of education with a funding formula. The plan has neither been put into operation or defeated, but this plan or one following the same principles must be adopted if there is ever to be accountability within the Bureau's system. The entangled bureaucracy in which the schools now function blurs all responsibility.

Quite apart from community pressures and educational needs, the powers on high have become arm weary flailing at the Bureau and have convinced almost everyone involved that they are ready to move Indian education out of the Bureau unless they can come up with some new plans.

When these new systems are developed and ready to go, they must be presented carefully and patiently to the Indian constitutents. If

presented this way, the earlier political opposition can be defused enough to allow the changes. It will be necessary to present the new plans to Indian groups in the presence of the very officials who have campaigned so vigorously against it. The entire process could take five to ten years, but without it, BIA education will not move significantly.

2. Financing Indian Education in Public Schools

What happens when public schools educating Indian children do not have sufficient funds to provide an adequate education? Who's responsible? Until 1974 schools on or near Federal reservations had the answer: The Bureau of Indian Affairs is responsible and should provide the money through Johnson O'Malley funding.

Except in states where the Johnson O'Malley plan did not allow it, districts would submit to the BIA a budget request that represented the difference between what they wanted to have in their budget and what they were going to get from all other sources.

This system, which should probably be called the Daddy Warbucks program, mystified all people who studied it, including the General Accounting Office.

In 1974 and again in 1975, the BIA regulations were changed to require clear evidence of need, i.e., line item budgets, Indian committee approval, guarantees against supplanting, and a 70% Indian population before a district could be declared eligible for basic operational funding.

At hearings held in April of 1977, this writer testified in support of the BIA regulations and the Director of the BIA's Johnson O'Malley program testified against them.

Neither Congress nor the BIA Director of Education is willing to return to the good old days in spite of pressure from LEA's, states and

some BIA Johnson O'Malley officials. The question remains, however: what is to be done about school districts that have met all the requirements of the regulations and still lack operating funds?

The PL 93-638 study of 1975 looked at every budget of every basic support school, i.e., those schools that received special aid from the Bureau based on their budget deficiencies. The study concluded that many of the schools were not poor by any known standard, and that the schools that were suffered either because of the absence of a state equalization formula, state discrimination against Indian school districts, or the failure of the states to take into account special cost factors such as unusually high transportation expenses, etc.

The study also concluded that although there are poor districts that are attended by on-or-near reservation Indians, it is not the presence of Indians that makes the district poor.

As interesting as this information may be, it does not solve the problems of these school districts. Federal solutions have been offered other than the return to the earlier Johnson O'Malley program. They've included ammending PL 874 so as to guarantee a local funding level equal to the state average or the average of other Indian districts, whichever is higher. A guaranteed adequate foundation program has also been proposed. The PL 93-638 study recommended a consideration of special status for overwhelmingly Indian reservation schools that would keep them out of the BIA system and at the same time remove them from the public school system when they were not getting adequate state funding.

A problem with all these proposals is that they guarantee future supplanting where it is now being done and invite supplanting where it has now been stopped.

Indian groups can theoretically take their case to their state boards of education or their state legislatures; but, in fact, there is very little effective Indian pressure on a state level.

Tension between Indian tribes and states is deeply rooted in history and remains active. There are probably ten legal battles between tribes and states on jurisdictional grounds taking place on any given day. On the one hand, the state is an adversary or potential adversary; on the other hand, there is a reluctance to deal with states except to keep them at a distance. It is not uncommon for otherwise sophisticated Indian leaders to deny the existence of a state role in public education.

Emphasis has always been on the Federal role, and that has been important in Indian education, but is has obscured the importance of the state functions. There are some states with significant Indian populations where the state funding is minimal. Indian districts effected by a lack of state commitment need to join with other poor districts hurt by the absence of equalization to lobby and change the formulas.

In other states (New Mexico, Montana, and Minnesota are prime examples) most of the education money comes from state sources. These states set educational standards which apply to Indian districts as well as others. Curricula, textbooks, course requirements, and certification standards are determined by state policies for a majority of Indian students, but Indian parents and tribes have been trained to focus on the 10% of the budget that is Federal rather than the 70% that comes from the states.

It is not enough to simply wish away the historical reflex that impedes negotiations with states and overemphasizes the Federal role in public school education. The Federal programs themselves have to be used as a passage for involvement in an entire school program. Now they serve

primarily as a diversion from the real questions.

Ironically, the very quantity of special Federal programs designed to enable school districts to properly educate Indians have, more often than not, served to take school districts off the hook. Their job is to provide a basic, standard, 36 regular, off-the-rack education, and if Indians want it tailored to their needs, they'll have to get that done with Federal funds.

VI. RECOMMENDED PRIORITY RESEARCH AREA

BIA Funding Formula

1. The most immediate research needs in the area of budget and administration are the development of a funding formula for BIA schools and the development of an efficient and workable system for tribal or local control of BIA schools. Since the BIA Director of Education is well aware of these needs and is currently working with NIE on them, there is no need to go into the question in detail.

State Funding Formula

2. Another immediate need is a study that will compare the funding formulas in various states and come up with some models that will deliver the necessary 'hard money' to Indian school districts. Part of this research should include the development of an LEA budget form that will compare line item amounts for basic operational support with line items amounts for all supplementary programs. Several years ago New Mexico began to move in this direction with a form which is included in Appendix C.

Relationship Between Stated Educational Goals and Budget Allocation

3. There is a need to answer the following question. To what extent do school districts put their money where their mouth is? If they say, for example, that their primary emphasis with Indian students is language remedial work, to what extent do they support this through teacher assignment and other budget allocations? This research would start with the student and work backwards. The district may have $1800 per student, but because of all supplementary programs, it may spend $3200 on Indian students in the seventh and eighth grade, but only $1600 per student in the early grades. ESEA Title I funds cannot legally be used to lower the pupil-teacher ratio, but both Johnson O'Malley and Indian Education Act

funds can be used for this purpose. Has this been done? Has it been successful by any measurable standard?

The research would have to develop some complex statistics that would discount factors such as teacher seniority or credential pay, but it could determine whether or not a district had allocated resources in a manner that was consistent with that district's perception of education priorities.

The same kind of research could be done exclusively with Federal programs. Example: A school district spends 95% of its Johnson O'Malley funds for vocational education because reading scores prove to the school's satisfaction that the Indians are not college material. Why isn't the money used for additional reading assistance in the lower grades? Is Title I money used instead? Another Federal program? We need some statistics that will tell us and let people (school and parents) on a local level know what the relationship is between one Federal program and another and between all Federal programs and the school's basic program.

It is necessary not simply to do the initial research in selected school districts but to follow up with wide dissemination of the analysis system itself so that it can be used by groups in any school system.

Indian parents are involved in all kinds of Federal committees and they're busy assessing needs, planning programs, evaluating programs, (theoretically anyway) but they can't really because they're planning necessary additions for an unknown structure. This not only makes planning impossible, it keeps the programs isolated from each other.

There is another question that should be addressed in this piece of research. To what extent have districts taken ideas from supplementary programs and incorporated them into the regular school program? Are they

planning to do it? Informal study tells me that it rarely happens and yet logic demands some attempt at incorporation. If good ideas were discovered, why not use them everywhere? And if they were't, why continue to operate the same kinds of programs with federal grants?

The Bilingual Education Act is supposed to give schools a five year planning and demonstration period after which they will run their own programs. I wonder if anyone believes that. Are schools making plans to take over the bilingual programs on their regular budgets? Some, somewhere, must be. We should know how they do it so we can give other districts the benefit of their experience.

Distribution Within Local Education Agencies

4. More and more states are developing funding formulas with weighted factors. New Mexico gives school districts additional funds for each bilingual pupil and additional funds for districts that have rural and isolated schools. That is the end of the state's role. After the districts get their money, they are free to budget it as they wish. That is, they're funded on the basis of relative need but they are under no obligation to then deliver to the needy. Do they?

In the Natonabah vs. Gallup-McKinley Schools (New Mexico) law suit, the court determined that the school system was not spending an equitable amount of funds in the outlying reservation schools. This decision forced the school district to develop a plan to shift resources to the Navajo schools.

Since this school district is as large as the State of Connecticut, it's not surprising that the local school administrators were not able to negotiate for their share.

This is not to suggest that we need research that will spark one

hundred lawsuits, but the information gathered should be of interest to State school committees or whoever is responsible for allocating the funds for the need distribution system.

Study of Success in Indian Education

5. The national appetite for stories of Indian squalor seems to be voracious. Researcher after researcher has catalogued every disaster from suicide to pre-school pregnancy. Some provide solutions. More often than not, the way out happens to coincide with the specialized field of the writer. There is no past, present, or future calamity that hasn't been slobbered over, but there is a serious shortage of studies of success in any clearly measurable way.

Individuals have studied the success of individual Indians and their family backgrounds and concluded that successful Indians are either not really successful because success alienates them from their culture, or that they are smart or lucky or both.

There has been no study that I know of that measures relative success in an entire school system or even a school building. If one takes, for example, the number of graduating high school seniors who are able to complete college and compares districts or schools, is there one place or several places that have done considerably better than others with otherwise comparable groups of students? If they have been successful, what's behind it? Is it a reflection of the instructional staff, the principal, the curriculum, the funds available?

Some Indian education does work and we should be able to say what it is, where it is, and why it works on that particular group of students.

APPROVED BUDGET

Submit in Duplicate To:
Chief, Public School Finance Division
Department of Finance and Administration
State Capitol Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
Final budgets shall not be altered or amended except for specific purposes and in accordance with statute.
PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE DIVISION

Page A
Fiscal Year 1977-78

PUBLIC SCHOOL BUDGET

REVENUE ESTIMATE WORKSHEET

FOR DATA PROCESSING ONLY:
D. P. CODE NO: ____ ___

RECEIPT CLASSIFICATION	RECEIPT CODE NO.	ESTIMATED (By School District)	FINAL ADJUSTED ESTIMATE (By P.S.F. Only)
OPERATIONAL FUND:			
LOCAL SOURCES:			
10.11 District School Tax Levy — Estimated by School Dist. / Final Adj. Estimate by P.S.F.			
District Valuation $ 172,372,916 $ 224,084,871			
Cross County Valuation (District No. / County) +			
+			
+			
TOTAL VALUATION $ 172,372,916 $ 224,084,871			
UNIFORM TAX RATE x .008925 x .008925			
PRODUCTION AT 100%	=10.11	1,538,428	1,999,957
10.12 Fees From Patrons (Purpose Swimming Pool $ 3,000 / Purpose ____ $ ____) (Purpose ____ $ ____ / Purpose ____ $ ____)	10.12	3,000	3,000
10.13 Tuition From Out of State (From State of: ____) $ ____ Per Pupil	10.13		
10.14 Earnings From Investments (Operational Fund Only)	10.14	10,000	10,000
10.17 Rent	10.17	121,200	121,200
10.18 Sale of Real Property, Equipment	10.18		
10.19 Miscellaneous (Identify) ____ $ ____ / ____ $ ____	10.19		
TOTAL LOCAL REVENUE		1,672,628	2,134,157
FEDERAL SOURCES:			
40.12 P.L. 874	40.12	3,004,004	3,004,004
40.15 Forest Reserve Income	40.15		
40.20 Regular Vocational Programs (Grades 1-12)	40.20		
40.21 Other Vocational-Special Projects (Identify) ____ $ ____ / ____	40.21		
40.40 Other Special Federal Revenue (Identify) ____ $ ____	40.40		
TOTAL FEDERAL REVENUE		3,004,004	3,004,004
PROJECTED ADM: ECE 200 FTE 1-12 2122 Sp.Ed. C&D 111 Non-Profit ____ TOTAL 2,433 (Rev. 1-A)			
STATE SOURCES:			
30.11 State Equalization Guarantee	30.11	1,619,123	1,180,670
SUPPLEMENTAL			
30.12 Out-of-State Tuition (To State of: ____ Est. No. of Pupils ____)	30.12		
30.13 Emergencies	30.13		
30.20 Transportation	30.20	419,538	435,448
30.30 Motor Vehicle License Fees	30.30	35,000	35,000
30.40 Other State Revenue (Identify Source/Purpose) ____ $ ____	30.40		
30.60 State Instructional Materials Credits	30.60	68,808	71,652
30.65 State Instructional Materials Cash 20%	30.65	17,202	27,202
TOTAL STATE REVENUE		2,159,671	1,749,972
NON-REVENUE SOURCES:			
60.00 Incoming Transfers From ____ Purpose ____	60.00		
SUB-TOTAL OPERATIONAL FUND ESTIMATED REVENUE AVAILABLE (10-60)		6,836,303	6,388,133
Anticipated Cash Balance as of June 30: (From Worksheet III)			
Non-Restricted—Available for Budgeting + $ 823,769 1,067,816			
Restricted—95% Credits − $ ____ 647,003			
Total Anticipated Cash Balance as of June 30		823,769	1,714,819
TOTAL OPERATIONAL FUND ESTIMATED RESOURCES AVAILABLE		7,660,072	8,602,952

COUNTY San Juan SCHOOL DISTRICT Central Consolidated NO. 22

APPROVED BUDGET

STATE OF NEW MEXICO — PUBLIC SCHOOL BUDGETS — REVENUE ESTIMATE WORK SHEET 1977-78 — Page 8

RECEIPT CLASSIFICATION	RECEIPT CODE NO.	ESTIMATED (By School District)	FINAL ADJUSTED ESTIMATE (By P.S.F. Only)
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS FUND (S.D. 9):			
Election Held 2-1-77 Tax Years 1977			
Tax Rate 2 Mills x Estimated District Assessed Valuation			
State Equalization Matching Proj. ADM x $35 Per Mill To Be Levied Total Cap. Imp. Guarantee Less 10.24 =	10.24	344,746	344,746
Earnings from Investments	30.40	35,564	35,564
Anticipated Cash Balance as of June 30: (Include fund investments not exchanged for cash)	10.14		
TOTAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS FUND ESTIMATED RESOURCES AVAILABLE		380,310	380,310
BUILDING FUND:			
Sale of Bonds	50.00		
Earnings from Investments	10.14	150,000	150,000
Other (Identify)	( )		
Anticipated Cash Balance as of June 30: (Include fund investments not exchanged for cash)		4,800,000	4,910,497
TOTAL BUILDING FUND ESTIMATED RESOURCES AVAILABLE		4,950,000	5,060,497
DEBT SERVICE INTEREST FUND			
Debt Service Interest Levy Tax Rate (P.S.F. Only) 1.226	10.20	308,535	260,992
Earnings from Investments	10.14	2,000	2,000
Anticipated Cash Balance as of June 30: (Include fund investments not exchanged for cash)		164,000	198,595
TOTAL DEBT SERVICE INTEREST FUND ESTIMATED RESOURCES AVAILABLE		474,535	461,587
DEBT SERVICE PRINCIPAL FUND:			
Debt Service Principal Levy Tax Rate (P.S.F. Only) 2.818	10.22	445,000	599,897
Earnings from Investments	10.14	4,000	4,000
Anticipated Cash Balance as of June 30: (Include fund investments not exchanged for cash)		355,000	372,206
TOTAL DEBT SERVICE PRINCIPAL FUND ESTIMATED RESOURCES AVAILABLE		804,000	976,103
FEDERAL PROJECTS FUND: Identify Source of Revenue			
ESEA, Title I	40.30	509,204	804,437
ESEA, Title I, Migrant	40.30		
SAFA-LRH	40.30		
ESEA, Title III	40.30		
ESEA, Title IV	40.30		
ESEA, Title V	40.30		29,503
ESEA, Title VI	40.30		
ESEA, Title VII—Bilingual	40.30		
ESEA, Title IX	40.30		
ESEA, Right to Read	40.30		
ESAA, Title VII—Minorities	40.30		
DAEA, Drug Abuse Ed.	40.30		
Adult Basic Ed.	40.30		
Driver Range	30.40/40.30		
IESAA, Title IV—Indian Ed.	40.30		
Adult Training (Model Cities—Dept. of Labor)	40.30		447,229
LEAA (Law Enforcement Assistance Act)	40.30		
	40.30		
	40.30		
	40.30		
TOTAL FEDERAL PROJECTS FUND ESTIMATED RESOURCES AVAILABLE		509,204	1,281,169
OTHER FUND: (Identify) Teachers Quarters	(10.17)	35,000	35,000
Earnings from Investments	10.14	1,000	1,000
Anticipated Cash Balance as of June 30: (Include fund investments not exchanged for cash)		40,000	41,467
TOTAL Teachers Qtrs. FUND ESTIMATED RESOURCES AVAILABLE		76,000	77,467
OTHER FUND: (Identify)	( )		
Earnings from Investments	10.14		
Anticipated Cash Balance as of June 30: (Include fund investments not exchanged for cash)			
TOTAL FUND ESTIMATED RESOURCES AVAILABLE			
OTHER FUND: (Identify)	( )		
Earnings from Investments	10.14		
Anticipated Cash Balance as of June 30: (Include fund investments not exchanged for cash)			
TOTAL FUND ESTIMATED RESOURCES AVAILABLE			
OTHER FUND: (Identify)	( )		
Earnings from Investments	10.14		
Anticipated Cash Balance as of June 30: (Include fund investments not exchanged for cash)			
TOTAL FUND ESTIMATED RESOURCES AVAILABLE			
OTHER FUND: (Identify)	( )		
Earnings from Investments	10.14		
Anticipated Cash Balance as of June 30: (Include fund investments not exchanged for cash)			
TOTAL FUND ESTIMATED RESOURCES AVAILABLE			
OTHER FUND: (Identify)	( )		
Earnings from Investments	10.14		
Anticipated Cash Balance as of June 30: (Include fund investments not exchanged for cash)			
TOTAL FUND ESTIMATED RESOURCES AVAILABLE			
GRAND TOTAL ESTIMATED RESOURCES AVAILABLE		14,854,121	16,840,085

COUNTY San Juan SCHOOL DISTRICT Central Consolidated NO. 22

Appendix C-2

Submit in Duplicate To:

Chief, Public School Finance Division
Department of Finance and Administration
State Capitol Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

STATE OF NEW MEXICO

FOR DATA PROCESSING ONLY
DP Code No. _____

PUBLIC SCHOOL BUDGET

1977-1978

APPROVED BUDGET
Final budgets shall not be altered or amended except for specific purposes and in accordance with statute.
PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE DIVISION

COUNTY San Juan SCHOOL DISTRICT Central Consolidated No. 22

EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATIONS		1 OPERATIONAL Actual Expenditures 1975-76	2 OPERATIONAL Estimated Expenditures 1976-77	3 OPERATIONAL FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	4 ALL OTHER NON OPERATIONAL Estimated Expenditures 1976-77	5 ALL OTHER NON OPERATIONAL FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	6 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 Proposed Budget	7 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	8 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 Temporary Budget Sec. 77-6-11/ 77-6-12A N.M.S.A.	9 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	10 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 Final Budget Sec. 77-6-12C N.M.S.A.	11 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	Expend Code No.
1.XXX ADMINISTRATION													
1.1XX Salaries Administration													
Superintendent	1.110	26,378	23,980	1.0			27,500	1.0	27,500	1.0	27,500	1.0	1.110
Administrative Associates	1.120	45,056	61,453	3.0			72,843	3.0	72,843	3.0	72,843	3.0	1.120
Administrative Aides	1.130		8,500	.5	18,471	1.0	9,095	.5	9,095	.5	9,095	.5	1.130
Secretary Clerical/Technical	1.140	70,108	75,747	9.0	20,171	3.0	92,260	9.0	92,260	9.0	92,260	9.0	1.140
1.3XX Purchased Services Admin.													
Audit	1.310		7,600		850		11,093		11,093		11,093		1.310
Legal Services	1.320	4,620	9,000				8,000		8,000		8,000		1.320
Election Expense	1.330		1,725										1.330
Bond Retirement Fees	1.340												1.340
Other Purchased Services	1.390	592	7,000		20,567		8,450		8,450		8,450		1.390
1.4XX Supplies & Matls. Admin.													
General Supplies and Matls.	1.400	12,018	8,000		9,548		7,000		7,000		7,000		1.400
1.5XX Travel Administration													
Travel	1.500	1,882	2,000		704		2,000		2,000		2,000		1.500
1.9XX Other Board of Education													
Board of Education Dues	1.930	1,631	1,632				1,632		1,632		1,632		1.930
Board of Education Travel	1.950	943	1,500				1,500		1,500		1,500		1.950
Board of Ed.-Other Expense	1.990	4,613	2,000				1,000		1,000		1,000		1.990
1.XXX Series Sub Total		167,841	210,137	13.5	70,311	4.0	242,373	13.5	242,373	13.5	242,373	13.5	

Appendix C-3

FOR DATA PROCESSING ONLY
DP Code No.

APPROVED BUDGET

Final budgets shall not be altered or amended except for specific purposes and in accordance with statute.

PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE DIVISION

EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATIONS		1 OPERATIONAL Actual Expenditures 1975-76	2 OPERATIONAL Estimated Expenditures 1976-77	3 OPERATIONAL FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	4 ALL OTHER NON-OPERATIONAL Estimated Expenditures 1976-77	5 ALL OTHER NON-OPERATIONAL FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	6 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 Proposed Budget	7 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	8 Temporary Budget Sec. 77-6-11/ 77-6-12A N.M.S.A.	9 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	10 Final Budget Sec. 77-6-12C N.M.S.A.	11 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	Expend Code No.
2.XXX DIRECT INSTRUCTION													
2.1XX Salaries Instruction													
2.14X Teachers													
Teachers Grade 1-12	2.141	2,649,544	2,617,400	212.0	245,721	36.0	2,866,213	213.0	2,866,213	213.0	2,866,213	213.0	2.141
Teachers Special Ed.	2.145	35,205	70,800	7.0			115,760	10.0	115,760	10.0	115,760	10.0	2.145
Teachers E.C.E.	2.149	135,186	123,450	12.0			140,800	12.0	140,800	12.0	140,800	12.0	2.149
2.18X Teacher Aides													
Teacher Aides Grade 1-12	2.181	61,534	35,000	9.0	408,652	70.0	33,500	7.0	33,500	7.0	33,500	7.0	2.181
Teacher Aides Special Ed.	2.185	17,514	30,100	7.0			46,340	10.0	46,340	10.0	46,340	10.0	2.185
Teacher Aides E.C.E.	2.189	52,555			47,197	10.0							2.189
2.19X Substitute Teachers													
Sub. Tchrs. Sick Leave	2.191	27,819	34,000		1,788		35,000		35,000		35,000		2.191
Sub. Tchrs. Other Leave	2.192	10,229	10,000		962		10,000		10,000		10,000		2.192
2.3XX Pur. Services Direct Inst.													
Purchased Services	2.300	16,718	20,775				23,212		23,212		23,212		2.300
2.4XX Sup. & Matls. Direct Inst.													
State Inst. Matl. Credits	2.410	51,459	62,804				68,808		68,808		71,652		2.410
State Inst. Matl. Cash 20%	2.420	6,045	10,000		55,116		17,202		17,202		27,202		2.420
Other Textbooks	2.430	2,374	4,000										2.430
Other Supplies & Matls.	2.490	66,964	60,000		118,662		87,350		87,350		87,350		2.490
2.5XX Instructional Travel													
Travel	2.500	2,328	1,000		2,765		1,500		1,500		1,500		2.500
2.XXX Series Sub Total		3,135,474	3,079,329	247.0	880,863	116.0	3,445,685	252.0	3,445,685	252.0	3,458,529	252.0	

11.9%

COUNTY San Juan SCHOOL DISTRICT Central Consolidated NO. 22

Appendix C-4

APPROVED BUDGET

Final budget shall not be altered or amended except for specific purposes and in accordance with statute.

PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE DIVISION

FOR DATA PROCESSING ONLY
DP Code No.

EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATIONS		1 OPERATIONAL Actual Expenditures 1975-76	2 OPERATIONAL Estimated Expenditures 1976-77	3 OPERATIONAL FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	4 ALL OTHER NON-OPERATIONAL Estimated Expenditures 1976-77	5 ALL OTHER NON-OPERATIONAL FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	6 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 Proposed Budget	7 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	8 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 Temporary Budget Sec. 77-6-11/ 77-6-12A NMSA	9 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	10 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 Final Budget Sec. 77-6-12C NMSA	11 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	Expend Code No.
3.XXX INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT													
3.1XX Salaries Inst. Support Pers.													
Principals	3.110	255,884	261,000	14.0			272,194	14.0	272,194	14.0	272,194	14.0	3.110
Subject Matter Specialists	3.120	17,140	16,000	1.0	65,833	6.3	21,876	1.0	21,876	1.0	21,876	1.0	3.120
Librarian Media Specialists	3.130	104,313	96,000	7.0	11,795	1.0	97,190	7.0	97,190	7.0	97,190	7.0	3.130
Guidance	3.140	50,044	52,828	4.0			56,994	4.0	56,994	4.0	56,994	4.0	3.140
Diagnstcn Psychmtrsts/Thrpsts	3.150		13,351	1.0			50,700	4.0	50,700	4.0	50,700	4.0	3.150
Other Professional Pers.	3.160				44,882	5.0					15,000	1.0	3.160
Sec. & Clerical Assts.	3.170	89,127	102,000	17.0	7,621	1.0	112,970	17.0	112,970	17.0	120,970	18.5	3.170
Instructional Support Aides	3.180		40,000	8.0	10,760	2.0	37,080	7.0	37,080	7.0	37,080	7.0	3.180
3.19X Substitutes-Inst. Support													
Substitutes Sick Leave	3.191	616	100										3.191
Substitutes Other Leave	3.192	44	300										3.192
3.3XX Pur. Services Inst. Support													
Testing & Scoring Statewide	3.310	1,075	2,000				3,500		3,500		3,500		3.310
Testing & Scoring Local	3.320	3,355	3,000		10,391		3,000		3,000		3,000		3.320
Other Purchased Services	3.390	2,927	3,050		23,758		4,435		4,435		4,435		3.390
3.4XX Supplies & Matls. Inst. Sup.													
Guidance & Testing	3.410	3,075	4,000				4,000		4,000		4,000		3.410
Library & Audio Visual	3.420	35,808	35,000		95,998		45,000		45,000		45,000		3.420
Other Supplies & Matls.	3.490	15,598	18,000		51,886		20,000		20,000		20,000		3.490
3.5XX Travel-Inst. Support													
Travel	3.500	1,385	1,000		5,318		1,000		1,000		1,000		3.500
3.XXX Series Sub Total		580,391	647,629	52.0	328,242	15.3	729,939	54.0	729,939	54.0	752,939	56.5	
4.XXX HEALTH SERVICES							12.7						
4.1XX Salaries Health Services													
Professional, Technical	4.110												4.110
Registered Nurses	4.120	42,560	39,000	4.0			43,000	4.0	43,000	4.0	43,000	4.0	4.120
Other Health Service Pers.	4.130				30,415	6.0							4.130
4.3XX Pur. Serv.-Health Service													
Purchased Services	4.300												4.300
4.4XX Sup. & Matls.-Health Serv.													
Supplies & Materials	4.400	1,144	2,000		1,996		2,500		2,500		2,500		4.400
4.5XX Travel Health Service													
	4.500	780	1,000		626		1,500		1,500		1,500		4.500
		44,434	42,000	4.0	33,037	6.0	47,000	4.0	47,000	4.0	47,000	4.0	

COUNTY San Juan SCHOOL DISTRICT Central Consolidated NO. 22

Appendix C-5

APPROVED BUDGET

Final budget shall not be altered or amended except for specific purposes and in accordance with statute.

FOR DATA PROCESSING ONLY
DP Code No.

EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATIONS		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
		OPERATIONAL			ALL OTHER NON-OPERATIONAL		OPERATIONAL 1977-78						
		Actual Expenditures 1975-76	Estimated Expenditures 1976-77	FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	Estimated Expenditures 1976-77	FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	Proposed Budget	FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	Temporary Budget Sec. 77-6-11/ 77-6-12A N.M.S.A.	FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	Final Budget Sec. 77-6-12C N.M.S.A.	FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	Expend Code No
5.XXX PUPIL TRANSPORTATION SERVICES													
5.1XX Sal. Pupil Trans. (Sch. Emp. ONLY)													
Supervisors	5.110	8,250	18,075	1.0			19,260	1.0	19,260	1.0	19,260	1.0	5.110
Bus Drivers	5.120		87,500	44.0			96,350	44.0	96,350	44.0	96,350	44.0	5.120
Mechanics & Garage Employ.	5.130		21,480	3.0			29,610	3.0	29,610	3.0	29,610	3.0	5.130
Sec. & Cler. Assists., Others	5.140												5.140
5.2XX Emp. Benefits-Pupil Trans.													
Educational Retirement	5.210	536	8,258				9,440		9,440		9,440		5.210
Social Security	5.220	483	7,433				8,496		8,496		8,496		5.220
Group Insurance	5.230	202	6,000				6,000		6,000		6,000		5.230
Workmen's Compensation	5.240		1,562				1,790		1,790		1,790		5.240
Unemployment Ins.	5.250												5.250
Other Employee Benefits	5.290												5.290
5.3XX Pur. Serv. Pupil Trans.													
Public Carriers	5.310												5.310
Private Operators	5.320	379,552	1,550										5.320
Maintenance by Private Gar.	5.330												5.330
Rent	5.340												5.340
Insurance	5.380	8,252	22,600				22,600		22,600		22,600		5.380
Other Purchased Services	5.390	291	1,073				1,330		1,330		1,330		5.390
5.4XX Sup. & Matls. Pupil Trans.													
Fuel	5.410		59,000				60,000		60,000		60,000		5.410
Oil, Grease, Gear Lub.	5.420		3,000				3,000		3,000		3,000		5.420
Tires & Tubes	5.430		5,000				5,000		5,000		5,000		5.430
Repair Parts & Supplies	5.440		38,450				29,811		29,811		29,811		5.440
Other Supplies & Materials	5.490		500				500		500		500		5.490
5.5XX Travel Pupil Trans.													
Travel	5.500		2,000				2,000		2,000		2,000		5.500
5.7XX Equipment Pupil Trans.													
Equipment	5.700	113,046	252,134				124,351		124,351		140,261		5.700
5.9XX Other Pupil Trans.													
Garage Operation	5.910												5.910
Garage Equipment Repairs	5.920												5.920
5.XXX Series Sub Total		510,612	535,615	48.0			419,538	48.0	419,538	48.0	435,448	48.0	

(21-7)

COUNTY San Juan SCHOOL DISTRICT Central Consolidated NO. 22

Appendix C-6

APPROVED BUDGET

Final budget shall not be altered or amended except for specific purposes and in accordance with statute.

PUBLIC SCHOOL ENABLE DIVISION

FOR DATA PROCESSING ONLY
DP Code No. _____

COUNTY San Juan SCHOOL DISTRICT Central Consolidated NO. 22

EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATIONS		1 OPERATIONAL Actual Expenditures 1976-78	2 OPERATIONAL Estimated Expenditures 1976-77	3 OPERATIONAL FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	4 ALL OTHER NON-OPERATIONAL Estimated Expenditures 1976-77	5 ALL OTHER NON-OPERATIONAL FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	6 Proposed Budget	7 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	8 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 Tentative Budget Sec. 77-6-11/ 77-6-12A N.M.S.A.	9 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	10 Final Budget Sec. 77-6-12C N.M.S.A.	11 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	Expend Code No.
6.XXX OPERATION OF PLANT													
6.1XX Salaries Operation of Plant													6.110
Plant Supervisors	6.110												
Custodians	6.120	288,086	288,185	35.0	1,259	.3	303,040	35.0	303,040	35.0	303,040	35.0	6.120
Sec. Clerical Assists./Other	6.130	5,950	7,682	1.5			16,855	1.5	16,855	1.5	16,855	1.5	6.130
6.3XX Pur. Serv. Oper. of Plant													
6.31X Heat													6.311
Heat for Bldgs. Electricity	6.311												6.312
Heat for Bldgs. Natural Gas	6.312	80,487	125,000	41%			187,500	50%	187,500		187,500		6.313
Heat for Bldgs. Prop/Butane	6.313	36,511	66,000	81%			80,000	21%	80,000		80,000		6.314
Heat for Bldgs. Other	6.314												6.320
Water & Sewerage	6.320	29,150	40,000				55,000		55,000		55,000		6.330
Electricity	6.330	96,297	140,000	45%			165,000	18%	165,000		165,000		6.340
Telephone & Telegraph	6.340	11,534	18,000		4,911		22,800		22,800		22,800		6.390
Purchased Services	6.390	1,253	3,000				3,000		3,000		3,000		
6.4XX Sup. & Matls. Oper. of Plant													6.400
Gen. Supplies & Matls.	6.400	25,209	39,400		848		41,000		41,000		41,000		6.500
6.5XX Travel Oper. of Plant													
Travel	6.500												
6.XXX Series Sub Total		582,477	727,267	36.5	7,018	.3	874,195	36.5	874,195	36.5	874,195	36.5	
7.XXX MAINTENANCE OF PLANT													
7.1XX Salaries Mtce. of Plant													7.110
Supervisors	7.110	22,120	23,565	1.5			27,095	1.5	27,095	1.5	27,095	1.5	7.120
Maintenance Personnel	7.120	56,340	69,230	9.0	1,722	.3	84,110	8.0	84,110	8.0	84,110	8.0	7.300
7.3XX Pur. Serv. Mtce. of Plant													
Purchased Services	7.300	27,607	35,000		5,758		34,000		34,000		34,000		7.400
7.4XX Sup. & Matls. Mtce. of Plant													
Gen. Supplies & Materials	7.400	83,068	90,000		24,149		94,000		94,000		92,710		7.500
7.5XX Travel Mtce. of Plant													
Travel	7.500	2,373	2,500				3,000		3,000		3,000		
7.XXX Series Sub Total		191,508	220,295	10.5	31,629	.3	242,205	9.5	242,205	9.5	240,915	9.5	

9.7%

Appendix C-7

APPROVED BUDGET

Final budget shall not be altered or amended except for specific purposes and in accordance with statute.

PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE DIVISION

FOR DATA PROCESSING ONLY
DP Code No.

EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATIONS		1 OPERATIONAL Actual Expenditures 1975-76	2 OPERATIONAL Estimated Expenditures 1976-77	3 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	4 ALL OTHER NON-OPERATIONAL Estimated Expenditures 1976-77	5 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	6 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 Proposed Budget	7 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	8 Temporary Budget Sec. 77-6-11/ 77-6-12A N.M.S.A.	9 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	10 Final Budget Sec. 77-6-12C N.M.S.A.	11 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	Expend. Code No.
8.XXX FIXED CHARGES													
8.2XX Employee Benefits													
Educational Retirement	8.210	257,196	265,000		44,378		294,282		294,282		294,282		8.210
Social Security	8.220	218,562	237,000		40,167		264,854		264,854		264,854		8.220
Group Insurance	8.230	76,147	91,000		10,964		100,000		100,000		100,000		8.230
Workmen's Compensation	8.240	17,093	19,000		1,499		23,000		23,000		23,000		8.240
Unemployment Insurance	8.250												8.250
Other Employee Benefits	8.290												8.290
8.3XX Pur. Serv. Fixed Charges													
8.31X Insurance													
Property Insurance	8.311	43,738	61,000	39%	4,511		79,800		79,800		38,200		8.311
Surety Bonds	8.312	350	350				400		400		400		8.312
Other Insurance	8.319						200		200		41,800		8.319
Rent	8.320				21,100								8.320
8.9XX Other Fixed Charges													
Tax Anticipation Notes	8.900												8.900
8.XXX Series Sub Total		613,086	673,350		122,619		762,536		762,536		762,536		
9.XXX FOOD SERVICES							13.3						
9.1XX Salaries Food Services													
Food Service Personnel	9.100												9.100
9.2XX Emp. Benefits Food Services													
Employee Benefits	9.200												9.200
9.3XX Pur. Serv. Food Services													
Purchased Services	9.300												9.300
9.4XX Sup. & Matls. Food Services													
Supplies & Materials	9.400												9.400
9.5XX Travel Food Services													
Travel	9.500										1,290		9.500
9.XXX Series Sub Total											1,290		
10.XXX NON-INST. STUDENT SUPPORT													
10.9XX Other Student Support													
Athletics	10.910	45,595	50,000				62,500		62,500		62,500		10.910
Other Activity Expense	10.990	13,010	22,500		976		10,000		10,000		10,000		10.990
10.XXX Series Sub Total		58,605	72,500		976		72,500		72,500		72,500		

COUNTY San Juan SCHOOL DISTRICT Central Consolidated NO. 22

Appendix C-8

APPROVED BUDGET

Final budget shall not be altered or amended except for specific purposes and in accordance with statute.

PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE DIVISION

FOR DATA PROCESSING ONLY
DP Code No.

COUNTY San Juan SCHOOL DISTRICT Central Consolidated NO. 22

EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATIONS	1 OPERATIONAL Actual Expenditures 1975-76	2 OPERATIONAL Estimated Expenditures 1976-77	3 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	4 ALL OTHER NON-OPERATIONAL Estimated Expenditures 1976-77	5 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	6 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 Proposed Budget	7 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	8 Temporary Budget Sec. 77-6-11/ 77-6-17A N.M.S.A.	9 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	10 Final Budget Sec. 77-6-12C N.M.S.A.	11 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	Expend. Code No.
11.XXX COMMUNITY SERVICES												
11.1XX Salaries Community Serv.												11.110
Adult Education 11.110												11.120
Recreation 11.120	2,863											11.130
Summer School After School 11.130				6,607								11.140
Summer Sch After Sch E.C.E. 11.140												
11.2XX Emp. Benefits Comm. Serv.												11.200
Employee Benefits 11.200				652								
11.3XX Pur. Serv. Community Serv.												11.300
Purchased Services 11.300				5,751								
11.4XX Sup. & Matls. Comm. Serv.												11.400
Supplies & Materials 11.400				45								
11.5XX Travel Community Services												11.500
Travel 11.500				125								
11.XXX Series Sub Total	2,863			13,180								
12.XXX CAPITAL OUTLAY												
12.6XX Cap. Outlay Other than Equip.												
12.61X Sites												12.611
Purchase of Land 12.611		25,000										12.612
Improvement of Land 12.612	35,230	10,000				35,000		35,000		35,000		
12.62X Buildings												12.621
Building Construction 12.621	923,749	172,000				70,000		70,000		70,000		12.622
Improvement of Buildings 12.622	10,150	10,000				80,000		80,000		80,000		
12.7XX Capital Outlay Equipment												12.700
New Equipment 12.700	143,696	110,000		191,258		110,000		110,000		110,000		
12.XXX Series Sub Total	1,112,825	327,000		191,258		295,000		295,000		295,000		
14.XXX OUTGOING TRANSFER ACCOUNTS						19.81						
14.9XX Tuition												14.910
In-State Tuition 14.910												14.920
Out-of-State Tuition 14.920												
14.XXX Series Sub Total												

Appendix C-9

Page 8

FOR DATA PROCESSING ONLY
DP Code No.

EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATIONS	1 OPERATIONAL Actual Expenditures 1975-76	2 OPERATIONAL Estimated Expenditures 1976-77	3 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	4 ALL OTHER NON OPERATIONAL Estimated Expenditures 1976-77	5 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	6 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 Proposed Budget *	7 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	8 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 Temporary Budget Sec. 77-6-11/ 77-6-12A N.M.S.A.	9 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	10 OPERATIONAL 1977-78 Final Budget Sec. 77-6-12C N.M.S.A.	11 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	Expend Code No.
15.XXX SPECIAL PROJECTS												
Parental Cost				91,172								
15.XXX Series Sub To.				91,172		9.1%						
TOTAL 1.XXX 15.XXX	7,000,166	6,535,122	411.5	1,770,305	141.9	7,130,971	417.5	7,130,971	417.5	7,182,725	420.0	15.
OPERATIONAL EMERGENCY ACCOUNT 16.XXX	xxxxxxxxxxx		xxxxxx		xxxxxx	(5 %) 317,197	xxxxxx	(3 %) 317,197	xxxxxx	(5 %) 318,924	xxxxxx	16.
TOTAL OPERATIONAL NON OPERATIONAL	7,000,166	6,535,122	411.5	1,770,305	141.9	7,448,168	417.5	7,448,168	417.5	7,501,649	420.0	
20.XXX BUILDING FUND												
20.6XX Capital Outlay Other than Equip.												
20.61X Sites												
Purchase of Land 20.611												20.611
Improvement of Land 20.612												20.612
20.62X Buildings												
Building Construction 20.621	309,500	1,000,000				4,900,000		4,900,000		5,010,497		20.621
Improvement of Building 20.622												20.622
20.7XX Capital Outlay Equipment												
Equipment 20.700		50,000				50,000		50,000		50,000		20.700
TOTAL BUILDING	309,500	1,050,000				4,950,000		4,950,000		5,060,497		
21.XXX DEBT SERVICE												
21.8XX Debt Service												
Interest 21.810	13,200	322,535				308,535		308,535		308,535		21.810
Principal 21.820	75,000	80,000				445,000		445,000		445,000		21.820
TOTAL DEBT SERVICE	88,200	402,535				753,535		753,535		753,535		

*Do not carry these totals forward to the Grand Total on Page 9

COUNTY San Juan SCHOOL DISTRICT Central Consolidated NO. 22

Appendix C-10

(Final budget shall not be altered or ... purpose ...)

FOR DATA PROCESSING ONLY
DP Code No.

EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATIONS	1 Actual Expenditures 1975-76	2 Estimated Expenditures 1976-77	3 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	4 Estimated Expenditures 1976-77	5 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	6 Proposed Budget *	7 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	8 Temporary Budget Sec. 77-6-11/ 77-6-17A N.M.S.A.	9 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	10 Final Budget Sec. 77-6-17C N.M.S.A.	11 FTE Personnel Units Of Tenths	Expend Code No.
	OPERATIONAL			ALL OTHER NON-OPERATIONAL		1977-78						
22.XXX SPECIAL PROJECTS (Other Funds)												
FEDERAL PROJECTS FUND:												
ESEA, Title I 22 910	610,592			787,769	80.49	509,204	65.5	509,204	65.5	804,437	65.5	22 910
ESEA, Title I, Migrant 22 911												22 911
SAFA, LRH 22 912												22 912
ESEA, Title III 22 913												22 913
ESEA, Title IV 22 914				29,503						29,503		22 914
ESEA, Title V Diagnostic Sp. Ed. 22 915												22 915
ESEA, Title VI Special Education 22 916												22 916
ESEA, Title VII Bilingual 22 917												22 917
ESEA, Right to Read 22 923												22 923
ESAA, Title VII Minorities 22 927												22 927
DAFA, Drug Abuse Ed. 22 928												22 928
Adult Basic Education 22 929												22 929
IESAA, Title IV Indian Educ. 22 934	359,337			467,723	20.83					447,229	43.49	22 934
Adult Trng. (Model Cities) D.O.L. 22 935												22 935
LEAA (Law Enforcement Asst. Act) 22 936												22 936
Sub-Total	969,929			1,284,995	101.32	509,204	65.5	509,204	65.5	1,281,169	108.99	
OTHER FUNDS:												
Special Bldg. - Local 22 951												22 951
Special Bldg. - State 22 952												22 952
Special Bldg. - Federal 22 953												22 953
P.L. 815 Building 22 954												22 954
Capital Improvements - S.B. 9 22 955						380,310		380,310		380,310		22 955
Follow Through 22 960												22 960
Headstart 22 961												22 961
N.Y.C. 22 962												22 962
C.A.P. 22 963												22 963
Teacherage 22 970	16,088			21,000		76,000		76,000		77,467		22 970
Johnson O'Malley 22 971	404,699			464,310	40.58							22 971
Work Incentive (W.I.N.) (E.S.C.) 22 974												22 974
Sub-Total	420,787			485,310	40.58	456,310		456,310		457,777		
22.XXX TOTAL SPECIAL PROJECTS	1,390,716			1,770,305	141.9	965,514	65.5	965,514	65.5	1,738,946	108.99	
GRAND TOTAL BUDGET	8,788,582			9,757,962	553.4	14,117,217	483.0	14,117,217	483.0	15,054,627	528.99	

*Complete opposite line item budget on authorized budget form (PSF Budget Form 2) for each program, exclusive of carryover.
**Column 2, Page 8 Oper., Bldg., Debt Serv. and 22 xxx Total Special Projects.

COUNTY SAN JUAN SCHOOL DISTRICT Central Consolidated NO. 22

Appendix C-11

APPROVAL OF TEMPORARY BUDGET IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTIONS 77-6-11/77-6-12A, N.M.S.A., 1953 COMPILATION:

As per 77-6-10 N.M.S.A., has the board of education received written notice of disapproval? Yes____ No✓

Board President

Board Vice President

Board Secretary

Board Member

Board Member

Board Member

Superintendent

Board Member

Chief, Public School Finance Division or Designee

Date May 17, 1977

APPROVED BUDGET
Final budget shall not be altered or amended except for specific purposes and in accordance with statute.
PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE DIVISION

Comments:

Copy of Legal Advertisement
To Be Attached Here

NOTICE OF PUBLIC BUDGET HEARING

Notice is hereby given that the Board of Education of Central Consolidated Schools, Independent District No. 22, County of San Juan, State of New Mexico and the Chief of Public School Finance Division will on Tuesday, May 17, 1977, 10:30 A.M., M.S.T. at the Administrative Office in Kirtland, New Mexico present and publicly review the budget for the 1977-1978 fiscal year.

This is a public hearing and all school patrons are invited to attend.

Done at Kirtland, New Mexico, this 9th day of May, 1977.

Central Consolidated District No. 22

Charles Lee, President

Legal No. 3156 published in the Farmington Daily Times, Farmington, New Mexico on Sundays, May 8 and 15, 1977.

APPROVAL OF FINAL BUDGET IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 77-6-12C, N.M.S.A. 1953 COMPILATION:

Chief, Public School Finance Division or Designee
Department of Finance and Administration
State Capitol Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico

August 18, 1977
Date

Comments:

FINANCE DIVISION
ADMINISTRATION
STATE OF NEW MEXICO

APPROVED BUDGET Page 11
Final budgets shall not be altered or funded except for specific purposes and in accordance with statute.
PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE DIVISION

PUBLIC SCHOOL BUDGET

1977-1978

RECONCILIATION OF ESTIMATED BUDGET AND RESOURCES

	TOTAL BUDGET	TOTAL RESOURCES	BALANCE UNBUDGETED
242,373			
1,458,529			
792,939			
47,000			
874,195			
240,915			
762,536			
6,378,487			
435,448			
1,290			
72,500			
295,000			
804,238			
7,182,725			
318,924			
TOTAL OPERATIONAL	7,501,649	8,602,952	YSE CREDITS 647,003 / UNEXPENDED 454,300
BUILDING	5,060,497	5,060,497	0
DEBT SERVICE INTEREST	308,535	461,587	153,052
DEBT SERVICE PRINCIPAL	445,000	976,103	531,103
FEDERAL PROJECTS	1,281,169	1,281,169	0
OTHER FUNDS:			
Capital Imprvts. SB 9	380,310	380,310	0
Teachers Quarters	77,467	77,467	0
ALS ALL FUNDS	15,054,627	16,340,085	1,785,458

TIONAL = 1.-4., 6.-8. x 5% = MAXIMUM EMERGENCY

San Juan SCHOOL DISTRICT Central Cons. NO. 22

VI. TEACHER TRAINING AND RECRUITMENT

An increasing number of universities, particularly in the west, are developing specialized courses in Indian education. Some of it is absurd on the face of it. Teachers who work with reservation schools travel 500 miles to a university to be told what Indians are like. Some of it may be with teachers who have taken Indian education courses.

Current rhetoric says we need either more Indian teachers or teachers who are sensitive to Indian culture. There is no such thing as Indian culture. There are tribal cultures and invariably numerous cultures within that tribe. An Indian family making $15,000 a year does not live the same way an Indian family lives that makes $2,500 a year. That's so obvious, it seems foolish to say it, and yet course after enlightening course talks about the Indian way of viewing the world.

The time has come to ask the teachers whether or not these courses were helpful. If they were, they should be increased. If they were misleading or useless, they should be replaced by other kinds of training.

It could be argued, of course, that few courses in education are ever viewed as helpful, and it's unfair to single out the Indian courses, but these courses are on the verge of becoming a part of a credentialing system. It is important to check the validity of this particular union card before it gets wide circulation.